

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

GEORGE ABRAHAM, et al.,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

TURNBERRY/MGM GRAND TOWERS,
 LLC, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:11-cv-01007-JCM-NJK

ORDER RE: ORAL MOTION
 TO CLARIFY

The Court has received a telephone call from the staff of Defendants' counsel seeking clarification of the deadline to file a reply to the motion to disqualify.¹ On September 20, 2013, the Court issued a minute order setting the reply deadline for October 4, 2013. Docket No. 62. When Plaintiffs filed their response to the motion, the CM/ECF system automatically generated a reply deadline of October 7, 2013. *See* Docket No. 63. "The notice automatically generated when a party electronically files a motion [or a response] is not a court order." *Carrillo v. B&J Andrews Enterps., LLC*, 2013 U.S. Dist. Lexis. 22010, *2 (D. Nev. Feb. 19, 2013). Accordingly, the Court's previously ordered briefing schedule remains controlling, *id.*, and the reply deadline remains October 4, 2013.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: September 30, 2013



 NANCY J. KOPPE
 United States Magistrate Judge

¹ As an initial matter, the Court reminds Defendants' counsel that they should refrain from making *ex parte* communications with the Court. *See* Local Rule 7-2(a).